



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,700	09/22/2003	Scott J. F. Zogg	03CR156/KE	9258

7590 03/09/2006

Rockwell Collins, Inc.  
Attention: Kyle Eppele  
M/S 124-323  
400 Collins Rd. NE  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498

EXAMINER

CHASE, SHELLY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2133

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/667,700	ZOGG, SCOTT J. F.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Shelly A. Chase	2133	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**SHELLY CHASE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 to 20 are presented for examination.

#### ***Specification***

2. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1 to 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recite the phrase "an efficient number" on line 4, creating unclear claim language. Claims 2 to 6 are also rejected due to their dependency on a rejected base claim.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2133

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 2, 6 to 8, 12 to 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haller et al. (USP 6182261 B1).

Claims 1 and 7:

**Haller** teaches an apparatus for iterative decoding of multi-component codes wherein the number of iteration is determined for reliable decoding. The apparatus comprising: a frame buffer (102) (“input port”) for receiving packets of data that are digitized (see col. 11, lines 45 to 50). Haller also teaches that the received data are transformed representing a probability value (“data throughput value”) (see col. 8, lines 3 to 5).

Haller teaches that a control unit (116) (“processor”) determines when to stop decoding of packets by determining when the minimum or the maximum number of iterations has been reached (see col. 12, lines 53 et seq.). Haller further teaches that each new packet is pass in a continuous process between the first and second decoders until a minimum number of iterations is reached (see col. 14, lines 55 to 68). Haller teaches that a CRC device checks for errors and outputs a signal indicating the termination of the decoding process (see col. 15, lines 40 to 65).

As per claims 2 and 8, teaches that the frame buffer (“data packet queue”) receives the packet and output the received packet for decoding (see col. 11, lines 45 to 55).

As per claims **6** and **12**, Haller teaches that for each new packet ("input value") the iteration number is set to zero and during the decoding of the packet the predefined minimum number of iterations is set accordingly based on achieving sufficient decoding quality (see col. 12, lines 65 et seq.).

**Claim 13:**

**Haller** teaches an apparatus for iterative decoding of multi-component codes in a digital receiver system that receives analog signals. The apparatus comprising: data buffers (62 & 64) ("data packet queue") for receiving packets to be decoded (see 9, lines 10 to 15). Haller also teaches a decoder (68) receiving the data from buffer and decoding the received data (62) (see col. 8, lines 14 to 23).

Haller further teaches that a control unit (88) ("processor") determines the minimal probability value LLR ("data throughput") that is used to decide whether to continue decoding or to stop decoding (see col. 8, lines 60 to 68 and col. 10, lines 29 to 40). Haller teaches that the number of decoding iterations is set according to the number of decoding for achieving sufficient decoding quality (see col. 10, lines 15 to 28).

As per claims **14** and **15**, Haller teaches that at the start of the decoding process counter is set to zero for each new packet that enters the system and a predetermined minimum iteration number is set based on a successful decoding quality as well as if the predetermined minimum number is not reached then the system strives for the maximum number (see col. 12, lines 55 et seq.), interpreted as "determine the number

Art Unit: 2133

of iterations to be performed each time before the iterative decoder begins to decode” and “each time before the iterative decoder begins an iteration while decoding a packet.”

As per claim **16**, Haller teaches that the frame buffer (“data packet queue”) receives the packet and output the received packet for decoding (see col. 11, lines 45 to 55).

As per claim **20**, Haller teaches that for each new packet (“input value”) the iteration number is set to zero and during the decoding of the packet the predefined minimum number of iterations is set accordingly based on achieving sufficient decoding quality (see col. 12, lines 65 et seq.).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims **3 to 5, 9 to 11 and 17 to 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haller et al. in view of Zhang et al. (USP 6233709 B1).

As per claims **3 to 5 and 9 to 11**, Haller does not specifically teach that the data throughput value is the rate at which data packets are received nor teaches that the determination is made by a reference table and that the table includes a number of iterations to be performed; however, Zhang in an analogous art teaches an apparatus

Art Unit: 2133

for iterative decoding that uses the BER to determine the upper and lower limits for the number of iterations and that a process or may determine the number of iterations from a lookup table (see col. 3, lines 25 to 65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of determining the number of decoding iterations of Haller to include using a BER and a lookup table as taught by Zhang since, Zhang teaches that decoding to balanced quality of service (QoS) is best achieved with the use of the BER parameter and the lookup table. This modification would have been obvious because a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ a process for achieving effective decoding by balancing the QoS as taught by Zhang. As to the further limitation of the claims, Zhang teaches that each data frame is process according to the required number of decoding iterations (see col. 4, lines 15 to 40).

As per claims 17 to 19, the claims recite similar limitations as that of claims 3 to 5 and thus, are rejected under the same rationale applied to claims 3 to 5.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shelly A. Chase whose telephone number is 571-272-3816. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur from 8:00 am to 6:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2133

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**SHELLY CHASE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**